

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/797,436	HEKMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Darren W. Gorman	3752	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Darren W. Gorman (Examiner).

(3) _____.

 (2) Charles Fredericks (Applicant's Representative).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 November 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1, 4, 6 and 9

Prior art documents discussed:

US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0092924

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant's representative to discuss a proposed Examiner's Amendment that would expedite allowance of the instant application on October 24, 2005. Examiner indicated that the prior art to Ingham, Jr. et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0092924), which was cited on Applicant's IDS filed May 10, 2004, anticipates at least claims 1 and 6 as filed, however Ingham et al. does not show or teach the limitations as recited in claims 4 and 9, which are directly dependent on claims 1 and 6, respectively. Examiner proposed incorporating the limitations of claims 4 and 9 into claims 1 and 6 by Examiner's Amendment, and canceling claims 16-18, which are drawn to an invention non-elected without traverse. Applicant's representative contacted the Examiner on October 28, 2005 to request that the Examiner consider additional references to prior art devices owned by the same assignee, in order to be sure that claims 4 and 9 are patentable over Ingham, Jr. et al. in view of the commonly owned prior art. Applicant's representative filed a formal IDS citing the references and faxed an informal copy to the Examiner for review. The Examiner considered the non-patent literature document references showing the co-owned devices on November 16, 2005 and found that the limitations of claims 4 and 9 as filed are allowable over the prior art. During the November 7, 2005 interview, Applicant approved the proposed amendments, should the Examiner find that the non-patent documents have no effect on the patentability of the claims.